



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,868	08/02/2001	Yen-Ting Lu	4425-168	4176

7590 10/21/2003

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP
Suite 310
1700 Diagonal Road
Alexandria, VA 22314

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

YOUNG, CHRISTOPHER G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
[REDACTED]	1756

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/919,868	LU, YEN-TING
Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher G. Young	1756

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1, 8-14, 17, 18 and 20-42 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,8-14,17,18 and 20-42 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on 23 May 2003 is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the RCE with attached amendment filed 9-25-03. In the amendment claims 2-7, 15, 16 and 19 were canceled. Claims 1, 14, 17, and 18 were amended. Claims 21-42 were added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 8-14, 17, 18 and 20-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pierrat, US Patent Number 5,780,187.

The Examiner has considered the amended claims, the newly added claims, and the comments attached thereto, however, they are not found to be persuasive in overcoming the prima facie obvious rejection of record as set forth in the previous Office Actions. The 35 USC 103 rejection over Yedur et al. has been withdrawn. The 35 USC 103 rejection over Pierrat is maintained. The Examiner relies on the comments of record presented in paragraph 4 of the previous Office Action, Paper No. 4, in combination with the following remarks.

The Examiner points out that the reference states a material deposition system is utilized (see column 5, lines 7 and 8) for depositing the fill material. Applicant's arguments are drawn to the preferred systems of the prior art, but there is nothing in the reference limiting the invention to the preferred systems. In fact, dip coating, spray coating and spin coating are the three most common material application methods in this art area for deposition of a fluid material. One of skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it prima facie obvious to utilize any well-known coating methods, including dip, spray and spin, in the teachings of the

Art Unit: 1756

prior art with a reasonable expectation of obtaining a highly useful photomask that has been repaired. Furthermore, there is nothing in the instant claims prohibiting the use of the ion beam milling and polishing for trimming the extra material as shown by the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 14 contains confusing language and should be redrafted to clarify the scope.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher G. Young whose telephone number is 703-308-2984. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Huff can be reached on 703-308-2464. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.



Christopher G. Young
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1756

cgy